no (9)

THE PRETENDER's DECLARATION

ABSTRACTED

345. k. 16 9

From two Anonymous PAMPHLETS:

The One Intitled

JUS SACRUM;

And the Other,

Memoirs of the **Chevalier St. George.**

With some MEMOIRS of two other **Chevaliers St. George** in the Reign of King HENRY VII.

Written by Mr. *ASGILL.*

Principiis obsta.

The Second Edition.

LONDON,
Printed by J. DARBY in *Bartholomew-Close*.
M. DCC. XV.

The Pretender's Declaration Abſtracted, &c.

THESE two Anonymous Pieces coming out both at the ſame time, and publiſh'd by the ſame Perſon, and ſuited together (as a Scabbard to a Dagger) may be ſuppos'd to have been written by the ſame Author.

And perhaps cunningly divided (as he thought) to evade a *double Treaſon:*

Whether that be ſo or not, they are Arrows from the ſame Quiver.

And the Difference is no more, than that in conjunction they are High Treaſon, within two Clauſes of the Act, 4 *Anne, cap.* 8.

And being ſeparated, the *Jus Sacrum* of it ſelf is High Treaſon within one of them.

By the firſt of thoſe two Clauſes, it is declar'd High Treaſon, *to affirm by Writing or Printing, That her preſent Majeſty is not Rightful Queen of theſe Realms; or that any other Perſon hath a Right, other than according to the two late Acts of Settlement of the Crown.*

And by the laſt of thoſe two Clauſes, 'tis made High Treaſon, *By Writing or Print to affirm, That the Kings and Queens of* England, *with the Parliament,*

ment, cannot limit and bind the Crown, and the Succeſſion thereof.

Now (you muſt know) that our Author's *Memoirs* is the Heraldry of his Chevalier *St. George*; blazoning him out as the *Legitimate Son* and Heir of the late King *James* II.

And under this Character, the *Jus Sacrum* hath avouch'd him to be the lawful King of theſe Realms according to the Laws of God,
of Nature,
the Civil Law and
Common Law.

Which is palpable Treaſon, within the firſt Clauſe of the Act, *as affirming that her preſent Majeſty is not Rightful Queen:* But that this Chevalier *St. George* hath that Right, contrary to both Acts of Settlement.

But without this Conjunction, the *Jus Sacrum* of it ſelf is an elaborate and repeated Affirmance, *That no Power on Earth can limit, alter, or ſettle the Crown, from the next of kin to the laſt Regnant.*

Which is a palpable Treaſon within the laſt Clauſe of the Act, as affirming, *That the Kings and Queens of this Realm, with the Parliament, cannot limit and bind the Crown, and the Succeſſion thereof.*

Now whether the Author be ignorant of theſe two late Acts of Settlement of the Crown (which are not the firſt, ſecond, or third Acts, by which the Crown hath been ſettled by Parliament)

Or whether he may think himſelf a bold Man for incurring High Treaſon, in vindication of his injur'd *Hero*, (as he calls him) I can't tell.

But if that be the Caſe, perhaps I think my ſelf as bold a Man in telling him of it: *(Conſideratis Conſiderandis)*

However,

However, I am ſure to get a Place by it: I can't miſs being put into one of the *Examiners*, and advertis'd in the *Poſt-Boy*.

But becauſe our Author hath given himſelf the Airs of arraigning the Laws of the Kingdom, as repugnant to the Laws of God;

He ſhall not have *Silence for Conſent*, nor the pleaſure to ſay,

——*Pudet, hæc opprobria vobis,*
Et dici potuiſſe, & non potuiſſe refelli.

Tho had his Tinge went no deeper than the Perſon of his Chevalier (who hath hitherto ſpent his Reign abroad, to get himſelf reputed of the Royal Family at home, without advancing to any higher Character than a Pretender) perhaps I might have *let it went with him*, (as we ſay in *Ireland.*)

But this *Holy Thing* call'd *Jus Sacrum* is calculated as a perpetual Almanack for the Succeſſion of the whole Royal Family; interdicting (with pretended Anathema's of Scripture) the Houſe of *Hannover* from the Crown, till all the other intermediate Relations, between her preſent Majeſty and that Houſe, are ſpent.

YOU muſt know that *Jus Sacrum* in *Latin*, is *Anglice, Indefeaſible Hereditary Right.*

But our Author (for brevity ſake) hath fill'd up his Title-Page with engliſhing of it: *viz.*

Or a Diſcourſe whereby it is fully prov'd and demonſtrated, That no Prince ought to be depriv'd of his natural Right on account of Religion, &c.

But

But (by way of Interruption) ſince our Author begins with *natural Right*, I would ask him a natural Queſtion, Whether in his *Et Cætera* he hath couch'd *natural Infirmities*.

Becauſe if he hath, I can contradict him without going any farther:

By citing a Caſe of a King depos'd for *Leproſy*.

2 Chron. 26. *And* Uzziah *the King was a Leper unto the day of his Death, and dwelt in a ſeveral Houſe, being a Leper; for he was cut off from the Houſe of the Lord, and* Jotham *his Son was over the King's Houſe, judging the People of the Land.*

Now let our Author go on.

To make good the Promiſe of his Title-page, he lays down three Poſitions:

1. That Monarchy is of Divine Inſtitution.

2. That Hereditary Succeſſion to that Monarchy is ordain'd by God.

3. That Kings are accountable to none but God, and therefore cannot be diveſted of their Kingdoms or Characters, but by God himſelf.

Which Poſitions he aſſumes to prove,

By the Laws of God,
of Nature,
Civil Law and
Common Law.

And with all this he happens to ken Logick, even to an *Enthymeme*.

Now (bear witneſs) that I am not going further to contradict his ſacred Notions, neither his *Poſita* nor *Poſitiva*, *Poſtulata* nor *Peſtilentia*, *Premiſes* nor *Concluſions*:

But ſhall leave them all as I found them (neceſſary Uſage of wearing and tearing, reading and obſerving only excepted.)

But

But tho I am not going to contradict him, I hope 'tis no offence to shew how he hath contradicted himself.

Being so unlucky in his Quotations, that the same Texts he brings to prove some one of his Positions do always contradict some other of his Positions, and so overthrow the *English* of his *Jus Sacrum*.

To be sure he begins with Scripture,

(In nomine Domini incipit omne Malum.)

Text 1. *By me Kings reign, and Princes decree Justice.*

Then if they decree Injustice, God disowns them on account of their Religion, *&c.*

Text 2. Samuel *said to* Saul, *The Lord hath rent the Kingdom from thee, and given it to a Neighbour of thine.*

Then *Saul*'s Kingdom was not Hereditary, and was taken from him on account of his Religion, *&c.* being not a Man after God's own heart, as his Neighbour *David* was.

Text 3. *I anointed thee King over the House of* Israel, *and gave thee the House of* Israel *and* Judah.

And yet *David* had then six or seven elder Brothers, who (according to our Author's *Jus Sacrum*) ought to have taken the Sceptre before him.

Text 4. Solomon *swore, As the Lord liveth, who hath set me on the Throne of* David *my Father.*

But *Solomon* being but a younger Son of *David* by a seventh Venter, while *Adonijah* and other elder Brothers were living; where then is the Birthright (which our Author saith, God always favours?)

Text 5. *God said to* Jeroboam, *I will rend the Kingdom from the hand of* Solomon, *and give ten Tribes to thee.*

Contrary

Contrary to the Right of *Rehoboam*, Son and Heir of *Solomon*, if this *Jus Sacrum* be true.

Text 6. *The Lord ſhall raiſe up a King over* Iſrael, *who ſhall cut off the Houſe of* Jeroboam *that day. 'Tis God that raiſeth the Poor out of the Duſt, and liſteth up the Beggar from the Dunghil to ſet him among Princes, and to make him inherit the Throne of Glory.*

If Beggars then may be made Princes by Inheritance, what may not Princes be made *(vice verſa?)*

Text 7. David *ſaid, God was his Shield and Protector, who ſubdu'd his People under him.*

And yet *David* was forc'd to fight, not only for his Conqueſts, but for his own Kingdom, againſt his own Son.

Text 8. *There is no Power but of God; whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God.*

But it doth not therefore follow, that God never ordain'd any Power but that of Kings; or that it is lawful to reſiſt all other Powers but Kings.

FROM theſe Texts our Author, by way of Tranſition, paſſeth over to Inſtances of Kings.

1ſt Inſtance. *We find Kingly Power inveſted in the four Kings that invaded the five that liv'd in the Plain of* Gomorrah.

And why not in the five as well as the four?

Tho perhaps our Author is cunning; for it ſeems the five were beat, till *Abraham* reſcu'd them from the four Conquerors, with 318 Men of his own Family:

Which

Which ſhews thoſe Kings were not very great Monarchs.

Nor (in truth) were the other eight any more than Subjects, or Homagers to *Chedarlaomer*, till they revolted.

Nor doth it appear that they had their Commiſſion immediately from Heaven, as our Author would make all Kings to have.

And therefore methinks ſo great a Champion for Monarchy ſhould have choſe out ſome other Baſis of it than this Example.

2d Inſtance. *That* Abimelech *was King of* Gera,
Pharaoh *King of* Egypt.
Melchiſedeck *King of* Salem.
Moſes *King in* Jeſhurun.

But I don't find him poſitive, That either *Melchiſedeck* or *Moſes*'s Kingdoms were Hereditary; tho I believe he might have been ſatisfy'd that they were not, and perhaps neither of them real (but only myſtical) Kingdoms.

But to make amends for that, he's confident the Aſſyrian *Monarchy deſcended from Father to Son for* 1300 *Years, from* Nimrod *the firſt King, without interruption.*

Then *Nimrod* himſelf had not his Kingdom by Inheritance.

Nor doth he ſeem to have had much *Jus-Sacrum Blood* in his Veins, being deſcended of the accurſed Race of *Ham*, deſtin'd unto Servitude.

Curſed be Canaan, *a Servant of Servants ſhall he be unto his Brethren.*

FROM theſe Inſtances of Kings, our Author makes a Tranſition to the Judges that ſucceſſively ſucceeded Moſes; *of which there being but one at a time, he infers God's conſtant Deſignation for Monarchy.*

But how he can conclude an Hereditary Monarchy from a Succeſſive Elective Juſtice-ſhip, is beyond my Logick.

But this he ſaith was before the Civil Government was well ſettled; but that when God came to ſettle it, he appointed *Saul* a King.

And this is the ſecond time that he hath quoted *Saul*, appointed a King for Life only, as an Inſtance of *Hereditary Monarchy*.

From thence he paſſeth on to *David* and his Seed.

Then he quotes the Prophecy of *Jacob*, That the Monarchy ſhould be Hereditary in the Tribe of *Judah*.

The Sceptre ſhall not depart from Judah, *nor a Lawgiver from between his feet, until* Shiloh *come.*

This happens to be no news to me, becauſe long before this *Jus Sacrum* came out, from this Entail of the *Jewiſh* Sceptre, I publiſh'd a ſhort Treatiſe,

That the Title of the Houſe of Hannover *to the contingent Succeſſion of the* Britiſh *Monarchy, is a Title Hereditary, and of Divine Inſtitution:*

As being conformable to this Inſtitution of the *Jewiſh* Monarchy; beſides which, there is not another extant by any ſpecial Ordination of God (altho all are by his divine Permiſſion and Providence.)

But this Entail of the Sceptre was to the Tribe of *Judah* in general, without ſpecial Limitations to the firſt and other Sons.

And as it was at firſt entail'd in the general, ſo it was afterwards executed in the alternative, ſometime in the elder, and ſometime in the younger.

And in the firſt Inſtance of this Execution, the whole Race of *Shelah* (then the elder Houſe of *Judah*) were paſs'd by, and the Sceptre deliver'd to the Deſcendant of *Pharez* (the younger Houſe) who

who ever after retain'd it, till the Diſſolution of that Monarchy.

Which I preſume doth not quadrate with what our Author would have, by his general Maxim,

That God always favours the Right of the Firſt-born.

(Always ſometimes.)

Tho the Words ſtrictly are true,

That God doth always favour the Right of the Firſt-born.

And ſo he doth the Right of the ſecond, and the Right of the third, and all the reſt:

For ſhall not the Judg of all the Earth do Right?

But the queſtion is, what that Right is.

The two Tables deliver'd by God to *Moſes* upon Mount *Sinai*, are an Abſtract of the whole moral Law, which is eternal, and not aboliſh'd by the Death of Chriſt.

I came not to deſtroy the Law, but to fulfil.

But with this eternal Law there is recorded a Law of Ceremonies and Sacrifices, and divers other Precepts, which were made but temporary only.

The Law of Ceremonies and Sacrifices was aboliſh'd by the offering up of that eternal Sacrifice of Chriſt.

And ſeveral other Precepts were preſcrib'd for the Uſe of the *Jewiſh* Nation only.

Some of which are ſince become Sin:

As that of one Brother's marrying another Brother's Wife.

Amongſt theſe temporary Laws was that Law of the Birthright, by which the eldeſt Son was to have a double Portion only, or twice as much as any one of the reſt.

But this being but a temporal Law, not incorporated into the eternal Law of the Decalogue, is not obligatory to the whole World, as the moral Law is.

But is changeable, according to the Times or Places in which Men happen to be born or to live.

And even in that there is Variety too.

As in *England* there are divers Inheritances, of which ſome deſcend to the eldeſt, ſome to the youngeſt, and ſome to all the Sons alike.

And the old Cuſtom of Thaniſtry in *Ireland (detur digniori)* left the Eſtate to the moſt worthy of the Family:

Which (in truth) was generally interpreted to him that had the greateſt Power to keep it from all the reſt.

And for a quite contrary reaſon, the Borough-*Engliſh* gave it to the youngeſt Son, as moſt unable to help himſelf.

But there being ſuch Diverſities of Inheritances, no one can determine what is the Right of elder or younger, without diſtinguiſhing according to the Times and Places where they are born and live.

BUT our Author (to do every thing extraordinary) hath quoted Inſtances in younger Sons, to prove the Birthright of the elder.

1. *That* Abraham *obtain'd the Promiſe of the Kingdom for* Iſaac *his Firſt-born Son.*

Now (in truth) *Iſaac* was his laſt-born, and born after *Abraham* and *Sarah* had quitted all hopes of Iſſue.

2. *That this Promiſe was renew'd to* Iſaac *for his Son* Jacob.

And yet *Jacob* had then an elder Brother.

3. *That* Jacob *propheſy'd of the Kingdom for* Judah.

And yet *Judah* was but a fourth Son, and ſeems to have the Nomination of the Sceptre fallen to him, in default of his three elder Brothers:

Reuben for Inceſt, and *Simeon* and *Levi* for Bloodſhed.

So

So that these three were set aside on account of Religion, *&c.*

By which our Author seems cruelly to mangle his *Jus Sacrum* of *Birthright.*

BUT to make out for this (and because *Juncta juvant)* he saith that Priesthood was Hereditary as well as Monarchy, and that the Son or neareſt Kinsman always succeeded the Father, till *Aristobulus* thrust out his elder Brother *Hircanus.*

Which I presume our Author don't relate historically only, but by way of Instruction, that this Succession in Priesthood may be reviv'd.

And then the eldest Son of an Archbishop must be always Archbishop:

And so for Bishops, Deans, and the inferiour Clergy.

And if no Sons, then the Function to go to Daughters; for our Author makes all Inheritances alike, and depends much on the Daughters of *Zelophehad*, who inherited to their Father in default of his Issue Male.

Tho this won't suit with Monarchy neither, unless he would have all Daughters to inherit the Crown together as Coheirs.

Which may convince us, That the *Jura Coronæ* or Laws of the Monarchy, and those of paternal Inheritances, are not suited to answer one another in every point.

BUT to follow our Author:

From the Old Testament he makes a Transition to the New.

And first he is mightily pleas'd with the Law, which the Farmers of the Vineyard had got among them-

themſelves: *This is the Heir, let us kill him, and we ſhall have the Inheritance.*

Which our Author ſaith theſe Farmers had from the Light of Nature.

For, ſaith he, *it is not to be preſum'd that they were skilful in human Laws.*

And in my Conſcience I believe ſo too.

Nor doth our Author ſeem over-skilful in Divine Laws.

For that, in fact, there never were any ſuch Men in the World as theſe Farmers; our Saviour putting forth this (as other Parables) by way of *Ænigma's*, and not as real things.

Another Quotation he takes from our Saviour, *The Children of the Kingdom ſhall be ſhut out.*

From whence *he infers that God may tranſlate Kingdoms from one Family to another, but not Man.*

But doth not God act by Man?

And if all Power be of God, then what is done by the Power of Man, is done by the Power of God.

BUT of all Texts he ſeems to cling cloſeſt to that of *Paul*; *If Sons, then Heirs.*

But this implies there muſt be ſomething for the Sons to inherit to, which another Apoſtle hath elſewhere ſignify'd; *To an Inheritance incorruptible, and that fadeth not away, reſerv'd in Heaven for you.*

But there are no ſuch Indefeaſible *Inheritances* among Men.

Man hath nothing on earth but what is corruptible and changeable by Time and Place: *Time and Chance happen to every thing under the Sun.*

Tempora mutantur, quoque nos mutamur in illis.

FROM

FROM theſe Texts (as the Laws of God) he makes a Tranſition to the Law of Nature.

By which he ſaith, *'Tis natural for Men to provide for their Children.*

And for this he appeals to every Man's natural Affection, That if he had never ſo much Poſſeſſions, he would leave them all to his Children.

What, all to his eldeſt Son only? For if not, it don't ſuit our Author's purpoſe.

And in truth, natural Affection would be but a random Title to Eſtates, and perhaps to Kingdoms too.

Maximilian the Emperor having two Grandſons, *Charles* and *Ferdinand*, had intended the Kingdom of *Spain* for *Ferdinand* (whom he beſt loved) but was diſappointed.

FROM the Law of Nature, our Author paſſeth to the Civil Law.

By which he ſaith *that the Prince (much leſs the People who are under his Subjection) cannot take away the Succeſſion that belongs to his lawful Heir.*

But this don't ſay that the Prince and People together cannot.

Nor is there any Succeſſion belongs to the Heir, unleſs the Predeceſſor leaves him ſomething to ſucceed to.

Then he falls into his *Jus Sacrum* again, *That Kingdoms are given by God*, &c.

But here he betrays the Shortneſs of his Memory.

For firſt he ſaith, *The Right of Succeſſion is a publick Agreement between Prince and People, which obligeth both Parties.*

Whereas

Whereas afterwards he affirms, *There's no Original Contract between King and People; and that all the King ſaith or doth to them is purely voluntary, but that what they ſay or do to him is binding.*

2. By this his Civil-Law-Law, he hath made it out, *That the Renunciation of* Philip *Duke of* Anjou *to the Crown of* France, *is void againſt his Iſſue.*

Which I ſuppoſe is a Slip beyond our Author's preſent Commiſſion.

Tho (with our Author's leave) I apprehend the Maxim of the Civil Law to be a Reverſe to what he would have.

The Civilians ſay, *Hæredes facti, non nati.*

No Man is born an Heir, any farther than the Laws of his Country make him ſo.

And by their Law, if a Father by Will ſaith, *I make* A. B. *my Heir*; that *A. B.* (tho a Stranger in Blood) ſhall inherit the Eſtate againſt the Son.

Which ſhews that the Inheritance is annex'd to the Right of the Eſtate, and not to the Perſon of the Son; who during the Life of the Father hath only a Chance to be Heir or no Heir, as the Eſtate ſhall be either left to him or diſpos'd from him.

FROM the Civil Law our Author paſſeth over to the Statute Laws of all Kingdoms, but what are Elective.

But whence came Elective Kingdoms, if all be Hereditary?

But *he ſaith he ſhould ſwell his Pamphlet too big, to enumerate all the Laws of this Kingdom in favour of Hereditary Right, from the Conqueror to the Revolution in* 1688.

An Emphatical Year! But what need of Statute Laws in favour of a thing that can't be otherwiſe? (as he ſaith.) For

For Instances he quotes,

1. *That* William *the Conqueror took care to have Allegiance twice sworn to him and his Heirs.*

That was to him and his Successors, *Heirs of the Kingdom*; which happen'd to be *William* his younger, and not *Robert* his eldest Son.

2d Instance. That *William Rufus* got *the Subjects to swear Allegiance to him, being jealous of their Affections to his eldest Brother* Robert; *Reasons of State inducing him to those Measures.*

O-ho! Now we have got to a fifth Law, *Reasons of State*: Anglice, *Arcana Imperii*, to rule the other four by.

But *William Rufus* having *no Issue*, our Author saith *he'll say no more of him, or any of his Successors, till* Henry VIII.

Why if he won't, I can't help it:
But if he won't, I will.
For that neither this *William Rufus*,
Nor *Henry* I. (his younger Brother)
Nor King *Stephen*,
Nor King *John*,
Nor *Henry* IV, V, or VI.
Nor *Richard* III.
Nor *Henry* VII. (without conjunction with his Queen) did either of them succeed to the Crown of *England*, according to the Right of our Author's *Jus Sacrum*.

For that during each of their Reigns there was in being one or other of the Royal Family nearer ally'd in Blood to the Crown, according to the Right of paternal Inheritances in *England*.

But these Breaches came to be heal'd in the Person of *Henry* VIII.

By which I am fallen in with my Author again; where I find he hath met with something he is mighty fond of, and hath made it his Pin-basket of Instances.

He ſaith, that by the Act 25 *Hen.* 8. the Remainder in the Crown (after default of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Iſſue) *is limited to the right Heirs of King* Henry VIII. *for ever, by courſe of Inheritance, as the Crown of* England *hath been accuſtom'd and ought to go.*

Which Statute (he ſaith) the Lords and Commons took an Oath to defend:

And which, he ſaith, hath not been repeal'd.

For (ſaith he) *tho ſome neceſſary Laws have been ſince made for the Security of our Religion and Civil Rights, yet the Right of Inheritance is ſtill in force.*

For (ſaith he again) *if the Right of Succeſſion could be taken away, it might be ask'd by what Right the Kings of* England *aſſume the Title of Kings of* France, *when by the Conſent of all the Eſtates of* France, *the Succeſſion of that Kingdom was adjudg'd to* Philip de Valois *againſt* Edward III. *when otherwiſe by the Common Law the Kingdom was due to* Edward III. *as Heir of his Mother.*

Now by our Author's luſty Skip from *William Rufus* to *Henry* VIII. and his Blazoning this Statute at large, and printing the words [*AS THE CROWN OF* ENGLAND *HATH BEEN ACCUSTOM'D AND OUGHT TO GO*] in great Letters; and ſaying that this Statute was ſworn to, and never repeal'd:

I find he hath ſingled it out as a Standard for his Chevalier *to demand the Crown of* England *by, as Heir at Law to* Henry VIII. according to that Settlement which the Lords and Commons then ſwore to.

But thoſe Lords and Commons are dead.

And the preſent Lords and Commons have ſwore to the preſent Settlements:

Which are no ways contradictory, but purſuant to that Settlement in *Henry* VIII.

When-

Whenever a Fee (or perpetual Eſtate) is limited, the word *Heirs* is inſerted, without which the Fee will not paſs.

But this is ſo inſerted as a word of *Limitation* only, without giving any Title or Property, either in Poſſeſſion or Reverſion, to the Son or next of kin to him to whom the Eſtate is ſo limited.

For whenever a Remainder in Fee is limited to a Man and his Heirs, he himſelf, without his Heirs, may limit away that Fee again to whom he pleaſeth.

So in this Caſe of the Crown, where the Remainder is limited to *Henry* VIII. and his Heirs, that Remainder remains ſubject and liable to be limited again by the like Legiſlative Power, by which the former Remainder was limited.

And purſuant thereunto, that Remainder hath been again limited by the two late Acts of Settlement.

By which there is nothing left for our Author's Chevalier, tho he were the Perſon that he would have us think he is.

Nor is there any Right of the Crown left to deſcend to any of the Royal Family, but to whom the ſame is limited by the preſent Settlements.

And ſuch Limitations of Inheritances away from thoſe who would otherwiſe have a Right to ſucceed, are allow'd in all Eſtates of Inheritance.

For 'tis not what the Father *lived ſeiz'd of*, but what he *died ſeiz'd of only*, that deſcends to the Son.

Therefore if this Chevalier *St. George* (or any one elſe for whom our Author writes) are coming to claim any Inheritance of the Crown from *Henry* VIII. he may inform them (if he pleaſeth) that 'tis otherwiſe diſpos'd of.

And by the ſame, and with as good reaſon as they would claim the Crown as limited to *Hen-*

ry VIII. and his Heirs, they may alſo claim all the Crown and Abby-Lands, of which the ſame *Henry* VIII. was ever ſeiz'd to him and his Heirs.

And as for the Kings of *England* aſſuming the Title of Kings of *France*, notwithſtanding it was determin'd againſt *Edward* III. by the States of *France*;

Neither *Edward* III. nor any King or Queen of *England* ever join'd with the States of *France* in that Determination: and therefore the Kings and Queens of *England* are no more bound by the Acts of the States of *France* (done without their Conſent) than they would by any pretended Acts in *England* without their Royal Aſſent.

BUT to return to our Author, he tells us that he hath now diſcharg'd what he promis'd to prove, That Hereditary Succeſſion to a Monarchy is of Divine Inſtitution.

From whence he ſaith, *It neceſſarily follows that neither their Elections or Title are owing to the Voice of the People; which makes them independent of their Approbation or Diſlike, and conſequently not accountable to them.*

But as neceſſary a Conſequence as it is, yet I find he thinks it neceſſary to try to prove it over again.

For this he ſaith, It is a Maxim in our Law, as antient as our Conſtitution, That the King can do no Wrong.

By which our Author would have us underſtand, That tho a King ſhould happen to do that which would be wrong in another Man, yet that the King, by his doing it, converts that Wrong into Right, according to that antient and laudable Maxim:

Turpia

Turpia Cerdoni, Voleſos Brutoſque decebunt.

But this Maxim in our Conſtitution, *That the King can do no Wrong*, is well grounded:

For that there are known Laws of the Kingdom ſutable to our Conſtitution, by which the King is to govern, and which if he obſerves he cannot err:

And whatever he acts againſt them, is void and goes for nothing.

THEN our Author falls to enumerating the uſual Texts for Duty and Reverence to Kings.

Which he ſaith *the Republicans would attribute to good Kings only.*

But he confutes them by ſaying, *That tho God may in his Rewards and Puniſhments diſtinguiſh between good and bad Kings;*

Yet that there is no ſuch diſtinction to be made by the People, who are to love and obey their Kings all alike, good or bad, merciful or cruel.

Why ay! for you know Subjects are but a parcel of Dogs or Swine: And you alſo know what's as good for a *Sow* as a *Pancake.*

But beſides he tells us, *That we ought to be more eaſy under a Tyrant's Government, becauſe he is appointed by God to puniſh the Sins of the People:*

In the nature of Confeſſors to enjoin Penance.

THENCE he proceeds to the Coronation-Oath.

'Tis granted (ſaith he) *that when Kings are ſet on the Throne, they are accuſtom'd to take an Oath:* (for faſhion-ſake, it ſeems.)

But

But to whom? Not to the People, but to God alone, who is the ſole Avenger of the Breach of it. So the Judgment of its Violation is to be refer'd not to the People, but to God to whom the Oath is taken.

But, ſaith he, *the People ſwear expreſly to the King, ſo as the People are bound to the King and his Heirs for ever.*

And yet, ſaith he, *none of the Subjects are puniſh'd for Perjury in breaking their Oath*; but for *violating the King's Laws and Royal Majeſty.*

Wherefore (ſaith he) *the Oath is not mutual (as is given out by Men of pernicious Principles:)*

But the King ſwears to God,

And the People ſwear by God to the King.

And if Swearing were not a Sin, I would ſwear that here are ſome of the niceſt Diſtinctions of *Swearing* and *Forſwearing* that ever I heard of.

But the Abſtract of the whole is this:

That Perjury in a King is a Sin againſt God, but no Sin againſt Man.

And *that Perjury in a Subject is a Sin againſt Man, but no Sin againſt God,*

But what a Republican King was *Henry* V. (not the leaſt Glory of the *Norman* Race) who refus'd to accept the Homage tender'd him by the Nobles and Commons, till he had firſt taken his Coronation-Oath?

Giving them thanks for their Goodwill, but ſaying, *That he would by no means accept of their Tenders, till he was crown'd, and had taken on himſelf as ſerious Obligations to be a good King, as he could lawfully deſire ſhould be laid upon them to be loyal Subjects.*

And when *Charles* V. of *Spain* inſiſted to have Allegiance ſworn to him before he ſwore to the Obſervance of the Laws, there aroſe a Conteſt, which was at laſt accommodated by ſome particular

ticular Persons first swearing Allegiance before his Coronation-Oath, and the rest afterwards.

BUT our Author (to distinguish Kings out of their Oaths) hath more Distinctions still.

There are (saith he) *two sorts of Limitations*; one by *Concession*, and the other by *Coercion*:

And *that all the Acts of Kings are Limitations of Concessions only.*

He allows *that a King may if he please (like God) limit himself to his Subjects by way of Concession only, by granting them such and such Laws:*

Which he saith is all the Original Contract between King and People.

And which yet (he saith) is neither *Original* nor *Contract.*

Not *Original*, because Laws are made by Kings: *Therefore* (saith he) *Kings must be before Laws.*

And had he flung but one Bar's length further, *That Kings were before Men too*, he had made his *Sacrum* a *Sacrissimum.*

But God ordain'd a Law for the Kings of *Israel (Deut.* 17.) above 300 Years before they had a King.

Which Law the Kings at their Coronation swore to observe as the *Jura Coronæ.*

2 Chron. 23. *Then they brought out the King's Son, and put on him the Crown, and gave him the Testimony, and MADE him King.*

BUT our Author *makes a special Challenge to produce the Law that made the first King in* England.

Why (*in promptu causa est*) *The Law of Arms.*

All

All Governments aroſe at firſt by Accident or Occaſion, and increas'd by degrees to what they are.

Nimrod was a Huntſman before he was a King; And from killing of Beaſts, he became a Conqueror of Men.

He began to be a Mighty One in the Earth, he was a mighty Hunter before the Lord.

And the firſt Kings by Increaſe of Power growing formidable to their Neighbours, put their Neighbours upon chuſing Kings (or Generals) to match their Enemies.

And thus the *Iſraelites* once choſe *Jephthah*: And for the Succeſs they had under *Gideon*, they offer'd to chuſe him King, and entail it on his Family.

Rule thou over us, thou and thy Son, and thy Son's Son; for thou haſt deliver'd us from the hand of Midian.

But *Gideon* refus'd it.

But Wars breaking out again and again upon them, they ask'd of God a King *to go in and out before them, and fight their Battels like other Nations.*

And thus the *Romans* in time of War choſe a Dictator for General, till at laſt one of thoſe Generals detaining, by Force, the Power firſt deliver'd him by Conſent, made himſelf Emperor.

And thus 'tis ſaid that thoſe *Saxons* in *Germany* (before their Invaſion of *Britain*) were govern'd by twelve Cantons, who in time of War choſe one General.

And having got footing here, they at firſt canton'd out the Country into eight Kingdoms.

Which was ſoon reduc'd to ſeven, call'd the *Heptarchy.*

And after that, the ſeven to ſix.

Then the ſix to two.

And

And last of all, the two to one, by King *Egbert*; who is therefore said to be the first Monarch of *England*.

And there's a Categorical Answer to our Author's Question; *By what Law the first King of* England *was made?*

BUT to return to our Author, who hath more News for us still.

The last he told us, was, That the King's Oath to the People was not mutual.

Now he tells us, *That the Laws which the King makes are no Contracts, nor binding to him, being wholly Concessions on his side.*

And for an Instance he cites *Magna Charta*; which he saith *begins our Statute-Book, and is solely from the King, of his mere and free Will.*

And so, forsooth! because this *Magna Charta* stands first in Mr. *Keeble*'s *Statute-Book*, there must never have been any Laws or Statutes in *England* before.

Whereas the Articles in this Charter were the antient Rights demanded by the Peers, and allow'd by *Henry* II. and King *John*, and after confirm'd by *Henry* III. and his Successors.

And if our Author had read it through, he had found the last words to be *Ratify, Approve,* and *Confirm.*

BUT our Author, from all these nice Distinctions, hath made a flat Conclusion:

That the sole Legislative Power is in the King.

For which he cites the Form of the Act:

Be it enacted by the King, by the Advice of the Lords, and the humble Petition of the Commons, &c.

And he hath put his &c. in a lucky place: for the very next words are, *And by the Authority of the ſame.*

Which words are inſerted in all the Acts backwards to 1 *Edw.* 4.

And from thence backwards, there are words that amount to it.

And 'tis ſtrange that none of the Kings or Queens of *England* ever underſtood their own Prerogative, till this Chevalier's Attorney-General found it out.

But never too old to learn:

Better late than never.

This may ſoon be alter'd when the Chevalier comes.

'Tis but changing the Writs of Summons to Parliament into ſo many *Subpœna's ad Teſtificandum*, for the Peers and Commons to come and witneſs ſuch Laws, as the King is going to make by himſelf.

And when they come, to be employ'd as Scriveners and Clerks to draw and ingroſs them.

But the Title of the Mony-Bills muſt be alter'd:

And inſtead of, *An Act for granting an Aid to his Majeſty, for the Uſes therein mention'd*;

It muſt be, *An Act for granting an Aid by his Majeſty, from his Subjects to himſelf, for ſuch Uſes as he ſhall think fit.*

And as for the Coronation-Oath, ſince 'tis a thing only between God and the King, 'tis no matter to the Subjects to know the Contents.

And ſo the King may either take it in private, or let it alone, (as he pleaſeth) and celebrate his Coronation as a Lord-Mayor's-Shew only.

BUT after all this, our Author hath Plumbs in his pocket for us.

He tells us, *That tho the King is not bound,*
By any Oaths that he takes,
Or Laws that he makes;
Being all but free Conceſſions only:
(And ſo he that gives them can take them away)
Yet he ſaith, that if his King be kept in good humour, and not otherwiſe provok'd by rebellious Wives, Children, or Servants;
That 'tis likely he may be kind to his Subjects:
But that they have no other way for it.

Why then I wiſh him a good Corn-cutter.

But why rebellious Wives put ſo cloſe with Servants?

This Courtſhip won't gain Female Proſelytes.

A Bleſſed Reformation!

The King to be *A-la-mode de France.*

And the Husband *A-la-mode de Spain.*

BUT ſince our Author hath ſo admirably perform'd his part, in making good his Title-Page;

I'll aſſiſt him with a Caſt of my Office, to draw his Chevalier's Declaration for him in form, from the Model and Maxims of his *Jus Sacrum:*

That I may make good my Title-Page too.

The Pretender's Declaration.

JAMES the Third (by virtue of Depoſitions taken in Chancery) of *England*, *Scotland*, (but not *France*) and *Ireland*, Chevalier.

Whereas one *William Henry Naſſau*, with divers tumultuous and malicious People, did in the Year 1688. make a Revolution; by continuance whereof We have been hitherto kept out of theſe Kingdoms, contrary to all Juſtice and Equity:

In tender Conſideration whereof, and for that ſuch Matters are properly relievable by Declarations, and a particular Act of Oblivion with general Exceptions:

We therefore of the Premiſes not being ignorant, do hereby of our certain Knowledg and Remembrance publiſh and declare our ſelves to be the ſole rightful King of theſe Realms (except *France* as aforeſaid) againſt all Occupyers and Poſſeſſors thereof.

And do thereupon demand admittance thereunto, without Fraud or further Delay, according to the true Intent and Meaning of theſe Preſents, and of two late Pamphlets publiſh'd on our behalf; the one intitled *Jus Sacrum*; and the other, *Memoirs of the Chevalier* St. George.

And whereas we have been inform'd, that ſince the ſaid Revolution in 1688. and alſo aforetime for the ſpace of 500 Years laſt paſt and upwards, the Crown and Royal Dignity of our ſaid Realms have been from time to time invaded and incroach'd upon by divers riotous Aſſemblies, who have taken on them to frame and deviſe certain things call'd Statutes, or Acts of Parliament, therein ſaid to be enacted by the Authority of the King,

King, Lords, and Commons, in manifeſt diminution of the ſole Legiſlative Power of the King:

Therefore in Vindication of ſuch our Right, We do hereby declare, That all and every the things aforeſaid, call'd Acts or Statutes, made or ſaid to be made by Authority of Parliament, to have been totally void *ab origine*. And therefore do legiſlate and enact, That all the pretended Records thereof be and are hereby abrogated, repeal'd and annull'd, to all Intents and Purpoſes whatſoever, (neceſſary Uſes only excepted.)

And for preventing the like Abuſes for the future, We do hereby of our ſelves and by our ſelves, in our own Perſon, and as a Noun Subſtantive only, enact and legiſlate, That from henceforth, inſtead of the Forms aforeſaid, all Acts of Legiſlature ſhall run in Form following, *viz.*

Be it enacted by the King's moſt Excellent Majeſty, with himſelf and by himſelf, of his own mere Will and Pleaſure, without any Advice or Conſent of the Lords Spiritual or Temporal, or Commons, either in or out of Parliament, or Authority of the ſame; That, *&c.*

And We do hereby, of our ſelves as aforeſaid, legiſlate, That to the Coronation-Oath ſhall be added this Clauſe:

Provided *nevertheleſs that this Oath ſhall be no ways binding to the Crown, for preſerving any Laws, Rights, or Liberties of Church or State therein mention'd; the ſame Oath being an Act of Conceſſion only, and not of Obligation: And that the Violation thereof ſhall not be eſteem'd any Sin againſt our Neighbour.*

And whereas the Titles of Crowns are no ways alienable from their Heirs; now purſuant to the ſaid Maxim, and for Value receiv'd from his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty *Lewis* XIV. We do for us and our Heirs grant and renounce the Right and Title

of

of the Crown of *France* to his ſaid moſt Chriſtian Majeſty and his Heirs.

And for quieting the Minds of our loving Subjects againſt Fears of our Diſpleaſure for things paſt, We do hereby declare, That all and every of them who ſhall without Fraud or further Delay come in and ſubmit themſelves to our abſolute Pleaſure and Diſpoſal, ſhall have our Royal Grant of Conceſſion to enjoy their Lives and Eſtates during our Royal Will and Pleaſure, (and Good Humour.)

[Except all and every Perſon or Perſons, who in Council, Field, or Gariſon, either in *England*, *Scotland*, or *Ireland*, were any ways adviſing, aiding or abetting the ſaid Revolution in 1688.

And except all Perſons, who ſince the 13th of *February* 1688. have voted in either Houſe of Parliament in *England*, *Scotland*, or *Ireland*.

And all other Officers, Civil or Military, who have taken the Oaths of Abjuration; (other than ſuch of them who ſhall abjure the ſame back again.)

And except all Perſons, who by Writing or Printing, Thought, Word, or Deed, have defam'd Us and our Title.

And except all Proteſtants whatſoever (not being *Jacobites.*)

And except all ſuch Perſon or Perſons, as We ſhall from time to time think fit to except by Name, on account of their Religion, *&c.*]

Some

Some MEMOIRS *of Two* Chevaliers St. George *in the Reign of* HENRY VII.

ALL Pretenders have an equal Liberty (with Poets or Painters) to call themſelves what they pleaſe.

And our Author having call'd his Pretender Chevalier St. George, *I call mine ſo too.*

KING *Edward* III. had four Sons, neither of which came to the Crown; but the Deſcendants of each of them did.

1. *Edward* the Black Prince of *Wales*, who had Iſſue *Richard* II.

2. *Lionel* Duke of *Clarence*, from whoſe Daughter and Heir deſcended *Edward* IV.

3. *John* Duke of *Lancaſter*, whoſe Son *Henry* came to be *Henry* IV.

4. *Edmund* Duke of *York*, from whom *Edward* IV. was deſcended by the Father's ſide.

Richard II. being depos'd, and *Lionel* Duke of *Clarence* and *John* Duke of *Lancaſter* dead, *Henry* (Son of *John* Duke of *Lancaſter*) was invited to accept the Crown; which he did by the name of *Henry* IV.

And left it to *Henry* V.

Who left it to *Henry* VI.

Which three *Henrys* were call'd the Line of *Lancaſter*.

Tho

Tho during their Reigns there were Heirs of the elder Houſe of *Clarence* intermarry'd into the Houſe of *York*.

But in the Reign of *Henry* VI. *Richard* Duke of *York* began the Civil Wars between the two Houſes.

Who being ſlain in Battel, *Edward* his Son proſecuting his Claim, recover'd the Crown (from *Henry* VI.) and died ſeiz'd of it by the Name of *Edward* IV.

Leaving two Sons, *Edward* V. and *Richard* Duke of *York*, and a Daughter *Elizabeth*, and other Daughters;

And a Nephew, *Edward Plantagenet*, (Son of *George* Duke of *Clarence*, his next Brother:)

And *Richard* Duke of *Glouceſter* his youngeſt Brother, and two Siſters, (or ſome ſay Aunts;) *Elizabeth* marry'd to the Duke of *Suffolk*, and *Margaret* to the Duke of *Burgundy*.

Edward V. was proclaim'd; but before he was crown'd, *Richard* Duke of *Glouceſter* uſurp'd the Throne, by the Name of *Richard* III.

Secur'd his Nephews *Edward* V. and *Richard* Duke of *York*, under ground;

And ſent his Niece *Elizabeth* and Nephew *Plantagenet* Priſoners to *Hutton*-Caſtle in *Yorkſhire*:

And was in queſt after *Henry* Earl of *Richmond* (a remaining Deſcendant of *John* Duke of *Lancaſter* by his third Wife) upon which, the Earl eſcap'd to *Flanders*.

But King *Richard* having by this Uſurpation and Tyranny render'd himſelf odious to the People, they ſent an Invitation to the Earl of *Richmond* to come and accept the Crown, and to marry Lady *Elizabeth*, King *Edward*'s eldeſt Daughter.

Which the Earl accepted; and landing with an Army of 2000 Men, and being join'd by others, gave King *Richard* battel at *Boſworth*-Field in *Leiceſter*-

Leiceſterſhire, 22 *Auguſt* 1485. where King *Richard* was ſlain, and the Earl proclaim'd King by the name of *Henry* VII.

Before he left the Country, he ſent for Lady *Elizabeth* and *Edward Plantagenet* from *Hutton*-Caſtle, and ſent the Lady to the Queen Dowager her Mother, but *Plantagenet* Priſoner to the *Tower*.

In *October* following the King was crown'd, and the Crown entail'd by Parliament on him and the Heirs of his Body, without any Entail of the Reverſion.

The 18th of *January* following he marry'd Lady *Elizabeth*.

But the delaying her Coronation, and impriſoning *Edward Plantagenet*, had diſguſted the People, and gave them an Impreſſion of him, as having an Averſion to the Houſe of *York*, whoſe Right they prefer'd to his.

And in order to blaſt his Title, it was rumour'd about that *Richard* Duke of *York* was not murder'd with his Brother *Edward* V. but permitted to eſcape, and was ſtill living.

To carry on this Project, one *Simon* an *Oxford* Prieſt undertook to get Duke *Richard* perſonated by (one of the Prieſt's Pupils, a ſprightly Lad of about the Duke's Age) *Lambert Simnel* a Baker's Son.

But another Rumour ariſing about the ſame time, that *Edward Plantagenet* was eſcap'd out of the *Tower*, (which ſeem'd more probable than the Reſurrection of Duke *Richard*;)

Simon transform'd his Pupil *Simnel* from Duke *Richard* to *Edward Plantagenet*.

By which, *Simon* ('tis ſaid) aim'd at a Biſhoprick.

The Siſters of *Edward* IV. (ſome ſay Aunts) being in the Project to trip up King *Henry*'s heels, that the Crown might revert to the Houſe of *York*.

For tho *Simon* buoy'd up *Simnel* with hopes of a Crown for himſelf, the Lad was only ſingled out for a Tool to run the Gauntlet of Fortune.

But this being a Scene that would act better abroad than at home, *Simon* ſail'd with his *Simnel* into *Ireland*, where the Affection for the Houſe of *York* was higheſt:

Where 'tis ſaid they made the firſt Addreſs to the Earl of *Kildare* Lord Deputy, who being (or ſeeming) poſſeſs'd with the Pretence as true, firſt communicated it to the Nobles, and after let it take vent among the People:

Who (as the Hiſtory ſaith) either out of Affection to the Houſe of *York*, or Pride to give *England* a King, proclaim'd *Simnel* King at *Dublin*, by the name of *Edward* VI.

King *Henry* (upon this News) to convince the People of the Cheat, caus'd *Edward Plantagenet* on a Sunday to be brought from the *Tower* to *Paul*'s Church in good Habit; where ſeveral Nobles and Gentlemen of his Acquaintance convers'd with him.

Which convinc'd the People in *London*; but the *Iriſh* turn'd the Impoſture upon the King, as if he had dreſs'd up a counterfeit *Plantagenet* in *England* to reſemble theirs in *Ireland*.

And knowing that *John* Earl of *Lincoln* (Son and Heir to *Elizabeth*, eldeſt Siſter or Aunt of *Edward* IV. by the Duke of *Suffolk*) had ſome thoughts of the Crown, the *Iriſh* ſent to him to come and join their *Plantagenet*.

The Earl having alſo receiv'd Letters about it from his Aunt the Dutcheſs of *Burgundy*, ſails over to her in *Flanders*:

Where it was conſulted, that if *Simnel* ſucceeded againſt the King, he ſhould be detected as a Counterfeit, and the true *Plantagenet* ſet up.

In order to this, the Dutcheſs furniſh'd Ships, and ſent 2000 *Almain* Soldiers to *Ireland* under Colonel *Swart*, to aſſiſt *Simnel*; who upon their Arrival was crown'd King at *Dublin*.

King *Henry* hearing that the Dutcheſs of *Burgundy* and Earl of *Lincoln* were at the bottom, found he muſt fight for the Crown again.

Simnel with his Army under four Generals, the Earls of *Lincoln* and *Kildare*, Lord *Lovel*, and *Swart*, landing at *Fouldneſs* in *Lancaſhire*, was join'd by Sir *Thomas Broughton*:

And gave the King battel at *Stokefield* near *Newark*;

Where the King had the Victory;

The four Generals kill'd,

Simnel and *Simon* taken priſoners.

Simnel (known to be only a Tool) the King would not put to death, but firſt put him a Servant in his Kitchin, and afterwards made him a Falconer.

Simon was commited to Priſon, and never heard of.

And this was the Succeſs of that firſt Chevalier.

BUT about five Years after (the Hiſtory ſaith) the King began again to be haunted with the Ghoſt of *Richard* Duke of *York*, rais'd by Dutcheſs *Margaret*; who had Spies abroad to find out handſom Youths to make *Plantagenets* or Dukes of *York* of.

For which there was brought to her a Son of *Peter Osbeck*, or *Warbeck* (a Convert *Jew* of *Tournay*, marry'd to *Katherine de Faro*) whoſe Buſineſs had drawn him and his Wife to *London* in *Edward* IV's Reign.

During which, this Son was born, and being known in Court, the King had honour'd him to

goſſip his Son by the name of *Peter*; afterwards call'd by the diminutive Name of *Peterkin* or *Perkin*.

And having perfectly learnt the *Engliſh* Tongue, and being a comely crafty Lad, was brought to the Dutcheſs:

Who keeping him with her in ſecret, inſtructed him in the common and ſecret Paſſages of King *Edward*'s Family;

And deſcrib'd to him the Perſonages of the King and Queen, and all their Children, and of ſeveral Courtiers and Servants at that time:

Adding to him Promiſes of the Crown, if he ſucceeded.

And with theſe Accompliſhments intended to ſend him to *Ireland*, at a time when King *Henry* ſhould be at war with *France*.

But that he might not be ſuſpected by coming directly from *Flanders*;

She ſent him with a Privado to *Portugal*, to expect further Orders:

Where he had continu'd about a Year, when King *Henry* had declar'd War againſt *France*.

Then ſhe ſent him Directions to ſail for *Ireland*, where he landed at *Cork*, aſſuming the Perſon of Duke *Richard*.

And drawing in Accomplices, he wrote Letters to the Earls of *Deſmond* and *Kildare* to come to his Aid, (the Originals whereof the Hiſtory ſaith are extant.)

Some time before this, the Dutcheſs had gain'd to her *Stephen Frion* (King *Henry*'s Secretary for *French*) who on diſcontent was fled to *Charles* King of *France*.

The *French* King (ready to embrace all Advantages againſt King *Henry*, and inſtigated by the Dutcheſs and *Frion*) ſent *Frion* and one *Lucas* as Ambaſſadors to *Perkin*, inviting him to *France*, as reſolving to aid him againſt King *Henry*.

Perkin

Perkin exalted with ſo great an Ally, ſails from *Ireland* to *France*:

Where he was receiv'd and lodg'd in State, by the name of the Duke of *York*, and a Guard aſſign'd to his Perſon.

And the Courtiers (to pleaſe the King) ſeem'd to take it as real.

And thither came to him about an hundred Gentlemen from *England*.

But the Hiſtory ſaith, that all this on the *French* King's part was but a Trick, to bring King *Henry* to a Peace.

And therefore upon the Entrance on the Peace at *Bulloign*, *Perkin* was warn'd away.

Who thereupon return'd to the Dutcheſs in *Flanders*, pretending (to all but the Dutcheſs) to be caſt there by various Fortunes, as never there before;

The Dutcheſs ſeeming to make him as ſtrange to her, ſaying, *She had been taught Wit by* Simnel, *how to give credit to any more counterfeit Stuff:*

And (in Company) would poſe him with hard Queſtions, whether he were the Duke.

But then being ſatisfy'd with his Anſwers, ſhe ſeem'd tranſported with aſtoniſhment at his Deliverance, as if riſen from the dead, and reſerv'd by Providence for ſome great Fortune.

And his Diſmiſſion from *France* ſhe magnify'd as the greateſt Teſtimony of his Sincerity, as being ſo conſiderable a Perſon, that the two Kings made him a Bargain of the Peace.

All which *Perkin* acted ſo well, that he was generally believ'd the real Duke; the Dutcheſs calling him Nephew, and aſſigning him a Guard of thirty Halberdeers.

This News came blazing to *England*, that Duke *Richard* was certainly alive.

And

And Sir *William Stanly* and others (in diſguſt with the King) eſpous'd *Perkin*'s Cauſe, and ſent over Sir *Robert Clifford* and another to *Flanders*, to give more certain Intelligence.

Sir *Robert Clifford* ſent back word, that he knew the Perſon of Duke *Richard*; and that this was the very Duke.

Upon this, things ſeem'd tending to a Revolt.

But King *Henry*, to detect the Counterfeit, ſent Spies into *Flanders*, and ſifted out *Perkin*'s Parentage abroad, and his Correſpondents in *England* and elſewhere.

And by degrees the King won off Sir *Robert Clifford*, who knew moſt of the Secret.

Then the King ſent Ambaſſadors to the Duke of *Burgundy*, to deliver *Perkin:*

Which the Duke excus'd, as being upon the Lands of his Mother-in-Law the Dutcheſs's Dowry, where ſhe was abſolute.

Whereupon the King baniſh'd the *Flemings* out of *England*, and the Duke the *Engliſh* out of *Flanders*.

But the King knowing that *Perkin* muſt depend more upon his Complices at home than abroad, executed ſeveral of them.

And Sir *Robert Clifford* coming to *England*, and impeaching Sir *William Stanly*, he was beheaded.

Perkin finding his Friends going down the wind, reſolv'd to paſs into *England*, and to try his Fate, by ſetting up his Standard on the Coaſts of *Kent:* where he arriv'd and caſt anchor near *Sandwich* in *July*, with a deſpicable number of Deſperadoes of ſeveral Nations.

And to ſound the Affections of the People, ſent ſome of his Men on ſhore, boaſting of the Power that was to follow.

But moſt of them were kill'd by the *Kentiſh* Men, and 150 taken priſoners, who were afterwards executed.

Perkin

Perkin hereupon returns to *Flanders*, and from thence again to *Ireland*.

But finding things there ſettled againſt him, he was advis'd to ſeek Aid from the King of *Scotland*, (ill-affected to King *Henry*.)

And getting Letters of Recommendation from *Maximilian* and the *French* King, he arriv'd in *Scotland* with a good Company, and was there honourably receiv'd by *James* IV. in preſence of his Nobles.

Before whom *Perkin* made a Declaration or Narration (almoſt half as long as our Author's *Jus Sacrum*) aſſerting himſelf the right *Richard*.

But ſaid, as to the manner of his Eſcape, it was fit to paſs in ſilence, in reſpect to ſome living and ſome dead.

Comparing himſelf to little *Joas*, ſav'd alive from the Tyranny of *Athaliah*. 2 K 11 — 2 Chron 22.

[*Let Pretenders alone for quoting Scripture.*]

And ſo caſt himſelf into King *James*'s Arms, for Aid to recover his Kingdom of *England*.

To which the King anſwer'd, *That whatever he were, he ſhould not repent him of putting himſelf into his hands.*

And after entertain'd him as Duke of *York*, and marry'd him to the Earl of *Huntley*'s Daughter, the King's Kinſwoman.

Not long after, King *James* with an Army (and *Perkin* with him) enter'd *Northumberland*.

And *Perkin* ſent a Proclamation before him, in the name of *Richard* Duke of *York*, true Inheritor of the Crown of *England*:

Therein offering a thouſand Pounds, and a hundred Marks *per ann.* for taking or killing King *Henry* (*by the name of one* Henry Tudor.)

But King *James* obſerving none of the Country flocking in to *Perkin*, thought he would prove of no uſe to him in that Expedition:

And

And ſo proceeded no further than *Northumberland*, which he ravag'd with his Army.

At which *Perkin* (to ſhew himſelf the true Parent of his Country) told King *James*, *That he had rather loſe his Kingdom, than purchaſe it with the Blood of his Subjects.*

To which K. *James* reply'd (half in ſport) *That he doubted he was careful for what was none of his own.*

However, *Perkin* returns with King *James* into *Scotland.*

During this, the *Corniſh* Men in *England* rebel'd, and came up towards *London*; but were routed at *Blackheath:*

And the *Scots* invade *England* again; but on a Truce contracted, *Perkin* left *Scotland*, and with his Lady and ſome Followers landed again in *Ireland.*

Where the *Corniſh* Men ſent to him to come into *Cornwal.*

Which he did, landing with about 120 Men at *Whitſons-Bay:*

To whom were gather'd about 3000 more.

Upon this, he puts forth a new Declaration, with Invectives againſt King *Henry*, and large Promiſes to the Subjects:

Stiling himſelf *Richard* IV. King of *England.*

And firſt they beſiege *Exeter*; but the Forces of the Country coming againſt them, they remove to *Taunton.*

From *Taunton* he fled by night with about ſixty Men, and took Sanctuary at *Bewly* in *Hampſhire.*

King *Henry* leaving a guard on the Sanctuary, ſent for the Lady *Katherine Gourdon* (*Perkin*'s Wife) and entertain'd her honourably, and gave her an Eſtate for her Life.

And *Perkin* ſubmitting to quit Sanctuary, was afterwards brought to Court, but not into the King's preſence; tho the King (for Curioſity) ſaw him out of the Window.

And

And when the King went for *London*, *Perkin* was brought after him with a Guard, and led on horſe-back to the *Tower*, and ſo back to *Weſtminſter*;

And examin'd as to his Pedegree, but not his Accomplices.

Eſcaping from his Keeper, he was retaken, and put in the Stocks; where he read his Confeſſion,

And was then ſent Priſoner to the *Tower*.

There getting to *Edward Plantagenet*, he put him, as 'tis ſaid, upon a Project for making their Eſcapes;

Which being diſcover'd, *Perkin* was ſoon after executed at *Tyburn* for Treaſon, where he read again his Confeſſion, and took it upon his Death to be true.

And thus ended this ſecond Chevalier.

Edward Plantagenet was ſoon after arraign'd and beheaded.

Which the People thought hard Uſage.

And in him the Male Line of the *Plantagenets* ended.

NOW if I am ask'd what I have repeated theſe old Stories for?

I can't well tell.

But by it we ſee that Pretenders to Crowns are no new things.

And to have great Perſons at home and abroad abetting them (ſome knowingly and ſome ignorantly, ſome cunningly and ſome fooliſhly, ſome for one end and ſome for another, and ſome for no end at all but Variety) is alſo no new thing.

And the Hiſtory tells us, That *Perkin* had ſo poſſeſs'd the People with his Pretenſion, that he himſelf began to ſuſpect whether it was not true.

And there's another Hiſtorian would ſtill have his Readers think, *That this* Perkin Osbeck *was not* Perkin Osbeck, *but the very* Richard *Duke of* York *which he aſſum'd to be.*

But it ſeems the Majority in thoſe days were of another mind, (and with good reaſon.)

Now this ſeems ſomething of the Caſe of the preſent Chevalier.

Some think him the real Son of King *James* and his Queen:

Others think there was Legerdemain in the Midwifery, (notwithſtanding the Depoſitions in our Author's *Memoirs)* and eſpecially ſince his Birth was ſo certainly predicted to be a Male, and reported about Town two hours before the time of Delivery in the Depoſitions.

Others think there was a Change in the Cradle, of which there are violent Suſpicions in Print.

And ſome others are not much concern'd or careful in this matter one way or other: with this difference only, That were there no Suſpicion in his Perſon, his Blood would have protected him from the Language he hath drawn on himſelf by aſſuming the Crown.

But be the Fact of his Birth as it will, he is but a Pretender to the Crown without Right, being legally excluded: (beſides his Attainder.)

And that with the higheſt reaſon, if there were no other, (as a Papiſt.)

NB A Diſability to which her Majeſty hath ſubjected her own Iſſue, ſhould they fall under it:

And by which all the intermediate Relations between her Majeſty and the Houſe of *Hannover* do ſtand excluded, without any Affront or Diſhonour to them.

Our

Our Author indeed has prefer'd his *Jus Sacrum* as an Indictment againſt thoſe Settlements, for ſtealing the Crown from his Chevalier; in hopes (as ſhould ſeem) one time or other to get a pack'd Jury, who may find it *Billa Vera*.

But as bad as thoſe Acts of Settlement are treated, I am glad we have them:

And that we had them when we had: and that there is a Proteſtant Branch of the Royal Family left (as a Teil-Tree) to inherit the contingent Succeſſion of the Crown.

And tho (to ſave our Author's Longing to know by what Law the firſt King of *England* was made) I took occaſion to mention Monarchy as an Acceſſion of Power, proceeding by gradation from leſſer Governments;

I am not thereby raiſing a Diſlike of Monarchy, or wiſhing a Return of it into any other Government:

But on the contrary, admiring that Perfection of Policy in the Conſtitution of the Monarchy of *Great Britain*, by which the Head is cemented to the Members, in the compleat Body Politick of Queen, (or King) Lords and Commons.

And from this Conſtitution it is ſaid, That the Kings (or Queens) of *England* never die.

For that tho their Perſons die like other Men,

Yet the Body Politick ſurviving, the Succeſſor immediately fills the Throne, without any new Election.

For which reaſon, the Kings, Queens, and Parliaments of *England* have been ſo careful not to leave that Succeſſion doubtful.

And therefore to prevent the Deſcent of the Crown to any but Proteſtants, the late Acts of Settlement were made.

And this is the Hook which King *William* left in the Pope's Noſe:

And which her preſent Majeſty hath happily clench'd by the Union, with the Succeſſion of the Crown in the Proteſtant Line.

And now becauſe his Holineſs's Bulls *(in Parchment under the leaden Seal of the Fiſherman)* are not at preſent current in our Country,

His Emiſſaries ſquib them abroad in Papers and Pamphlets of *Jus Sacrum*, &c. curſing and damning all the Laws and Law-makers diſabling Catholicks from the Crown on account of their Religion.

And yet thoſe Holy Fathers (and Holy Sons) of *Rome*, would never let the Proteſtant Kings of *France* reſt on the Throne, till they had declar'd themſelves Papiſts; and after that, murder'd them, as being not cruel enough to Hereticks.

And yet again they would now diſpenſe with their Catholick Chevalier to turn Heretick, to bring the Crown of *Great Britain* again under the Pope's paw.

(Any thing to get ſome *Peter-Pence* in an honeſt way.)

And yet in both theſe Extremes they would be eſteem'd infallible.

And tho they uſe but little Scripture at home, they are very copious in it abroad:

And tho they pray in *Latin* only, they can curſe in all Languages when things don't go their way.

Otherwiſe they are good-humour'd (as our Author ſaith his Chevalier will be, when he is pleas'd.)

And ſo is ſomebody elſe;

From whom, *Libera nos Domine.*

And after all this, perhaps ſome of the Pretender's now pretended Friends may have no better Thoughts for him, than thoſe Pretenders pretended Friends then had for them; who (had they ſucceeded to dethrone the then King) were (at beſt) only to be paid for acting, and ſent home

again

again with ſomething to drink their Maſters and Miſtreſſes Health that employ'd them; there being then other Takers ready for the Crown, of whoſe Perſons there was no ſuſpicion.

Nor do I think that all this Duſt is now rais'd ſo much to ſet up the Pretender, as to pull down (the Bulwark of the Church and State) the two late Acts for Settlement of the Crown.

Againſt which, ſuch Doctrines as this *Jus Sacrum* are ſpread about, hoping the People will of themſelves make the proper Application when time ſerves.

And I hope ſo too.

But I remember an ingenious Gentleman, who fancying he had found out the perpetual Motion in the Mathematicks, had all the parts of his Scheme fram'd in pieces by the Mechanicks: but being put together, he diſcover'd one Fault in it, *That it would not go.*

Now I muſt needs ſay, that theſe *Jus Sacrums*, *&c.* are pretty ingenious things; but being examin'd by the Teſt, they diſcover one Fault in themſelves, *That they are not true.*

A Country Farmer obſerv'd, *That he never knew a Man do a good Day's Work, that eat two Meſſes of Porridge to his Breakfaſt.*

And I believe one might hold odds of Six to Four, That a Man who begins his Argument in a Triangle of two Adjectives to one Subſtantive, writes himſelf out of breath before he has done.

Indefeaſible-Hereditary Right,

Is a pretty Amuſement enough for a Motto upon a *Sun-Dial.*

But when the Inventors of it try to explain it, and tell what they would have by it, it terminates in a Jeſt: *Deſinit*

Deſinit in piſcem Mulier formoſa ſuperne.

But that I may not take all the Quarrel on my ſelf:

If theſe *Jus-Sacrum Divines* can convince the Lawyers, I'll knock under table.

The Lawyers have a common Term among them, of *being ſeized of an Indefeaſible Eſtate of Inheritance.*

But they ſay with it, That whoever is ſo ſeiz'd, may alienate that Inheritance from his Son or Heir apparent, without their Conſent; *For that every Man hath his Heirs in him.*

But theſe *Jus-Sacrum Lawyers* deny that; and ſay, That the Inheritance is lodg'd in the Son or Heir expectant, who cannot be defeated of that Expectancy by Father or Anceſtors.

But ſhould theſe Gentlemen turn this their Law into Practice, and ride about as Attorneys-Itinerant, delivering Ejectments againſt all the Lands in the Kingdom alienated by Anceſtors from their Heirs expectant:

Would they not deſerve (think you) to be indicted for Barretors?

Why then ſhould the Legiſlature be condemn'd, for declaring thoſe to be Traitors who attempt to diſturb the Peace of the Realm, by libelling the Settlements of the Crown?

But won't they turn the Libel upon me?

If they do, I have *ſon aſſault demeſne* for it; *They began firſt.*

They have had their Saying,
And I have had mine.

And if they claim Privilege (as Plaintiffs) to have the Reply, I ſubmit to the Court.

But if I don't miſtake them, they are but as *Coventry-Bowlers*, who play their beſt at firſt.

THE END.